

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

**KEITH STENNIS,** )  
Petitioner, )  
vs. )  
**PEOPLE of the STATE of ILLINOIS,** )  
Respondent. )

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

**STIEHL, District Judge:**

This action was opened solely upon receipt of Petitioner’s “motion for extension of time” (Doc. 1), which the Clerk construed as a habeas corpus petition. The Court granted Petitioner’s request for additional time to file his habeas petition; the Court also directed him to pay the \$5 filing fee or file a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 3). Those pleadings were due by March 10, 2006, but that deadline has long since elapsed without any communication of any sort from Petitioner, even though he was advised that failure to respond to that order would be grounds for dismissal of this action. FED.R.CIV.P. 41(b); *see generally Ladien v. Astrachan*, 128 F.3d 1051 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997); *Johnson v. Kamminga*, 34 F.3d 466 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994).

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that this action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice for failure to comply with an order of this Court. FED.R.CIV.P. 41(b); *see generally Ladien v. Astrachan*, 128 F.3d 1051 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997); *Johnson v. Kamminga*, 34 F.3d 466 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994).

## **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: April 20, 2006.**

s/ WILLIAM D. STIEHL  
DISTRICT JUDGE